



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

County Board Agenda Item Meeting of March 15, 2014

DATE: March 12, 2014

SUBJECT: Request to Advertise Public Hearings to consider the adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework (Attachment 1).

C. M. RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the attached resolution to ratify the advertisement placed on March 18, 2014, and to authorize further advertisement to be placed on March 25, 2014, as notification of public hearings at the April 12, 2014 County Board and associated Planning Commission meetings to consider the adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework (Attachment 1).

ISSUES: This is a request to advertise public hearings for the adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework, a key milestone and important foundation for developing a full Rosslyn Sector Plan Update. Based on extensive analyses, the plan framework was prepared by an interdepartmental County staff and consultant team with close coordination with the Rosslyn Process Panel and ongoing public outreach with the broader community. Leading up to the request to advertise, the draft framework is continuing to undergo community review to identify areas of consensus or outstanding issues. Staff will work to address all submitted comments and will recommend proposed revisions where warranted before the County Board considers the adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework.

SUMMARY: The Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, adopted in 1992, and related implementation efforts have helped initiate the transformation of Rosslyn from an auto-oriented office district toward a walkable neighborhood with a more balanced mix of uses. In anticipation of the next generation of redevelopment within central Rosslyn, the County Board charged staff with initiating a planning review process to provide updated guidance for the future of Rosslyn that focuses particularly on improvements to the public realm, including elements such as urban

County Manager: *BMD/GA*

County Attorney: *[Signature]* *[Signature]*

Staff: Anthony Fusarelli, DCHPD
Matthew Ladd, DCPHD
Kelly Cornell, DES
Alexander Iams, AED
Scott McPartlin, DPR
Meliha Aljabar, DPR

29.

design, parks and open spaces, the transportation network, and the positive impact building height and form can have on the quality of the pedestrian experience in Rosslyn.

Since the project kick off in December 2012, the County has held over 30 public meetings, workshops and outreach events, resulting in a refined vision for Rosslyn and general community consensus on a number of specific policy issues. An interdepartmental County staff and consultant team, in close collaboration with the Rosslyn Process Panel and other stakeholders, have developed the Rosslyn Plan Framework to articulate these vision principles and policy directives. Completion of the framework document is an important milestone in the planning process; it will help set the foundation for developing a complete Rosslyn Sector Plan Update later this year. The framework has been directly shaped by input received at many community meetings, various technical and other analyses, and consideration of a range of options as well as prior plans for Rosslyn. At this time, it is anticipated that the adopted Rosslyn Plan Framework would become the foundation for and be incorporated into a final Rosslyn Sector Plan Update to be brought to the County Board for adoption in the 4th Quarter of 2014.

BACKGROUND: Building on previous planning studies for Rosslyn from 1962 and 1977, the County updated the plan for Rosslyn in 1992, outlining new strategies to achieve the preferred vision for Rosslyn as a vibrant place to live and work with ample opportunities for shopping, recreation, and cultural activities. Following the adoption of the 1992 Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, the County created the “C-O Rosslyn” zoning district as the primary implementation tool for achieving this vision. In the 18 years since its adoption in 1996, four “C-O Rosslyn” projects with an estimated total of 1.6 million square feet of commercial space, 520 residences, and 160 hotel rooms have moved Rosslyn in a direction more consistent with the vision of the Plan Addendum. Two additional approved “C-O Rosslyn” site plans will add 1.1 million square feet of commercial space, 507 residences (with construction having just begun on 377 of these), and 148 hotel rooms in central Rosslyn in the near future. Two additional “C-O Rosslyn” site plan filings are currently undergoing County review, with more proposals anticipated in the coming years. Each such project, brings additional opportunities to help advance Rosslyn closer to the community’s preferred future vision for the area.

Recognizing that an update to the 1992 Plan Addendum would be beneficial in guiding the anticipated redevelopment of key sites in the central core of Rosslyn, in June 2011 the County Board approved a scope of work for a Rosslyn Sector Plan Update that addresses four topic areas:

- A better **urban design** framework to create a Rosslyn that is a more attractive and functional place to be;
- A more specific and deliberate **building heights strategy** to help the County prioritize its goals for Rosslyn’s skyline;
- A refined multimodal **transportation system** consistent with current Master Transportation Plan policies to support enhanced access to transit for Rosslyn’s residents, workers, and visitors, while providing rights-of-way that will accommodate Rosslyn’s future district energy needs; and
- A more cohesive and functional **parks and open space** network to meet the recreational needs of Rosslyn while enhancing its public realm.

Branded as “Realize Rosslyn”, the community planning process to develop the Rosslyn Plan Framework (and ultimately the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update) has involved a combination of broad based civic engagement efforts in addition to close coordination with a Rosslyn Process Panel comprised of representatives of key Rosslyn stakeholder groups. This approach has been effective in drawing a spectrum of broader input from Rosslyn residents and workers, while allowing the staff and consultant team to work closely with the Process Panel to help analyze and refine emerging ideas and proposals for the plan. Highlights of the community process to date include:

- A December 2012 workshop and series of community events to kick off the planning process;
- Community visioning workshops in March 2013 to help steer the direction for initial concepts;
- October 2013 community workshop on big ideas and preliminary proposals for the emerging plan framework;
- Regularly held Rosslyn Process Panel meetings to help advance work on the plan content and to address planning and preparations for community engagement events;
- Meetings and briefings with a variety of County advisory commissions and committees;
- Dozens of stakeholder interviews; and
- A five minute long “Up Close” segment on Arlington TV about the Realize Rosslyn process to develop a Sector Plan Update.

Staff anticipates that upon adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework, a final Rosslyn Sector Plan Update document will be drafted, reviewed and refined for County Board consideration and adoption later in 2014. This final plan would incorporate the vision principles and policy directives from the framework document with supporting text and graphics and implementation recommendations.

DISCUSSION: The proposed Rosslyn Plan Framework sets forth a vision statement, vision principles, and policy directives that represent the recommendations from the planning process to date. Collectively, these major recommendations and policy guidance will serve as an important foundation for the development of a complete Rosslyn Sector Plan Update during the coming months.

The **Overview** section of the Rosslyn Plan Framework describes the process for developing the vision and recommendations articulated in the framework. The **Plan Foundations** section highlights Rosslyn’s assets and describes the challenges to completing the transformation of Rosslyn from an auto-oriented office district into a walkable and dynamic mixed-use urban center. This section also presents opportunities to use future public and private investments to help achieve the vision for Rosslyn. As demonstrated through the Likelihood of Change map, the strong potential for redevelopment can result in significant change that can play an integral role in the continued transformation of central Rosslyn over the next 20 years.

The next section of the framework document, **A Bold Vision**, begins with the vision statement for Rosslyn:

“Rosslyn is Arlington’s world class downtown: the greatest concentration of jobs, housing, and activities in Arlington; an important gateway between Arlington and the Nation’s Capital; a preeminent destination with unparalleled views of and connections to Greater Washington; a vibrant and diverse community of people living, working, learning and playing together; a sustainable urban district that embraces its waterfront; a strong economic engine for the region and the commonwealth; the jewel of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor.”

This section also conveys six vision principles to guide the detailed policy directives for future redevelopment and public improvements in Rosslyn. The framework illustrates each vision principle through images, text and bold ideas.

The vision principles for Rosslyn are as follows:

- Rosslyn will be a global destination with a dynamic skyline, unique vistas, and exceptional value.
- Rosslyn will be accessible via exceptional transportation connections and choices.
- Rosslyn will be a walkable neighborhood connecting people with community and choices.
- Rosslyn will be a good neighbor to adjacent communities, making sensitive transitions of building form and offering complementary housing and service options.
- Rosslyn will be an urban district that celebrates its relationship with nature through its diverse network of public parks, open spaces, and tree-lined streets.
- Rosslyn will be a dynamic place inspired by its mix of people and activity.

The **Policy Directives** section outlines the major recommendations that have been developed through the planning process and informed by community input to date. The framework document organizes the draft policy directives by the four topic areas included in the Board-approved scope of work:

- Transportation,
- Public Parks and Open Space,
- Urban Design, Land Use and Sustainability, and
- Building Heights and Form.

Highlights of the draft policy directives are as follows:

- **Transportation Policy Directives**
 - Make Rosslyn one of the premier transit hubs in the region by working with WMATA on emerging plans for a second Rosslyn Metro Station, enhancing local and regional bus service in Rosslyn, and preserving the potential for a future extension of the planned streetcar line from Georgetown to Union Station;
 - Transform the pedestrian and bicycle networks with wider sidewalks and new walkways as well as additional bike lanes/cycle tracks.
 - Enhance Rosslyn’s street system by extending 18th Street through Central Rosslyn, redesigning North Fort Myer Drive and North Lynn Street as complete streets with two-way travel and removal of the tunnel below Wilson Boulevard, and improving the public realm along North Moore Street.

- **Public Parks and Open Space Policy Directives**
 - Enhancing connectivity among a diverse network of public open spaces, including the riverfront, an Esplanade, a revitalized Freedom Park, and the extended 18th Street corridor.
 - Revitalize the existing parks and open space system to provide active recreational opportunities and lifestyle amenities in spaces such as Gateway Park and other Rosslyn parks.
 - Provide opportunities for informal congregation and passive leisure activities as part of Rosslyn's overall urban environment.
 - Provide good walking and biking connections to park and open space opportunities outside the plan area, such as the revitalized park that will be planned through the separate West Rosslyn Area Planning Study.

- **Urban Design, Land Use and Sustainability Policy Directives**
 - Continue to advance Rosslyn's transformation into a high-density, mixed-use district, consistent with the General Land Use Plan.
 - Strategically focus retail locations and activate ground floor uses in areas where the market will not support retail.
 - Increase the amount of housing in central Rosslyn and its overall diversity.
 - Ensure that building design respects the human scale and design buildings to transition to surrounding, lower density residential areas.

- **Building Height and Form Policy Directives**
 - Develop a new building heights policy for central Rosslyn that incorporates varied building heights and advances objectives such as preserving high-priority view corridors, transitioning to sensitive edge conditions, and balancing sun and shade opportunities.
 - Encourage more varied building facades and massing across a range of scales and add distinction to building tops and the overall Rosslyn skyline.

Community Input on the Plan Framework: The staff and consultant team has worked closely with the Rosslyn Process Panel to conduct analyses, explore ideas, and refine preliminary proposals to develop a Rosslyn Plan Framework. The Rosslyn Plan Framework has also been informed and refined by community input received through workshops, stakeholder interviews, and meetings with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission and advisory commissions such as the Planning Commission, Transportation Commission and the Park and Recreation Commission. Staff has documented the substantive comments and issues shared in these discussions in Comment and Response Matrices (Attachments 2 and 3) with responses from the project team and proposed changes to the February 24, 2014 draft of the Rosslyn Plan Framework. A revised draft, dated March 12, 2014, (Attachment 1) includes proposed changes as described in Attachments 2 and 3 and as also informed by other community input to date.

Rosslyn Process Panel: Since the October 2013 workshops on emerging concepts and preliminary proposals, the Process Panel has met four times to review and help refine the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework. Overall, there is general consensus on most of the document's

recommendations, while there are a few elements on which there continue to be differences of opinion, to be discussed later in this report under key issues.

Park and Recreation Commission: The Park and Recreation Commission discussed the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework at its meeting on February 25, 2014. The commission was generally supportive of the framework's direction and did not raise any major issues at this meeting.

Transportation Commission: The Transportation Commission discussed the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework at its meeting on February 27, 2014. The commission was generally supportive of the framework's direction and expressed interest in addressing bicycle and pedestrian safety issues at the intersection of North Lynn Street and Lee Highway in the framework.

Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission: The LRPC met to discuss the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework on February 27, 2014. The committee provided a number of comments on the framework, which are documented with staff responses and proposed changes in Attachment 2. The draft Rosslyn Plan Framework presented as Attachment 1 to this report has been updated to incorporate all proposed changes identified in Attachment 2. It is anticipated another LRPC meeting will be scheduled between the March County Board Meeting and the April Planning Commission meeting to address the advertised Plan Framework document.

Community Open Houses: Community open houses on the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework were held on March 11 and 12, 2014, with an estimated 40 to 50 total participants. These sessions were hosted by the project team to present an opportunity for interested individuals to learn more about the draft plan framework, ask questions of project team staff, and provide input. Staff is in the process of reviewing comments and can report back on any key themes or findings in the presentation at the County Board Meeting.

Planning Commission: At its meeting on March 5, 2014, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the request to advertise the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework. The staff and consultant project team provided a brief overview of the draft framework and addressed the major issues raised at the February 27 LRPC meeting. Four individuals spoke at the hearing, and the commission provided additional comments on the framework. All comments from speakers, Planning Commission members, and written comments received in regard to this meeting are documented with staff responses in Attachment 3. The draft Rosslyn Plan Framework presented as Attachment 1 to this report has also been updated to incorporate all proposed changes identified in Attachment 3.

The Planning Commission recommended that the County Board authorize advertisement of public hearings for the Rosslyn Plan Framework in April with seven specific recommendations for modifications to the draft. The seven recommendations are addressed in Attachment 3.

Key Issues: Below are the following key issues that have arisen based on the extensive community engagement and discussions described above.

- **Use Mix Targets:** The Planning Commission recommended that the framework define use mix targets necessary to support the vibrant 18/7 street life described in the plan vision. The project team has revised the draft framework in response to this recommendation to provide more detail on the forecasted land use and development program through 2040. Through policy directive U3, the framework also recommends increasing the amount of housing in the RCRD but does not yet set a specific target for a land use mix. Staff will explore setting a use mix target in greater specificity through the completion of the Sector Plan Update.
- **Approach to Public Facilities:** The Planning Commission also recommends that the framework should provide information on any new public facilities that are required or proposed to support the vision for Rosslyn. To date, public facilities have not been part of the discussions with the community or the Rosslyn Process Panel because this topic was not identified in the specific list of issues to be addressed through this study. Nevertheless, as use mix targets are developed in greater detail, staff will preliminarily assess whether there should be further study on potential needs and solutions for certain public or community facilities in Rosslyn.
- **The Skywalk System:** In discussions with the Process Panel and Planning Commission, opinions about the future of the remaining skywalk system in Rosslyn were varied. Some contend that the skywalk segment extending west from the Metro station should be retained as an additional option to the 18th Street corridor, while others believe the skywalk should not be rebuilt when those sites with existing segments are redeveloped. Over time, several segments of the Rosslyn skywalk network have been deconstructed with recent site plan developments. The draft Plan Framework sets forth a recommendation, through Directive T9, to maintain this portion of the skywalk until such time when a new 18th Street connection between Oak Street and Fort Myer Drive is completed. This approach is consistent with County Master Transportation Plan policies, and could help further activate the new 18th Street corridor by focusing more pedestrian traffic along it.
- **New Streets west of N. Oak Street:** In Process Panel discussions, concerns were raised about the recommendations for new street connections between Wilson Boulevard and N. Oak Street. Primary concerns were focused on the potential for additional traffic, and how these new streets could take away opportunities for additional open space. The Plan Framework recommends these street connections to help strengthen the urban grid, thereby providing additional connectivity through this area. New streets here would also advance goals to relocate parking garage entrances and loading/service access points off of Wilson Boulevard and onto these new local streets with redevelopment. With no clear opportunities for extensions further north into the North Rosslyn neighborhood, these streets are anticipated to be relatively low volume, low speed local streets, and are generally not expected to result in cut-through traffic.
- **Building Heights above the Observation Deck:** In Process Panel discussions, neighborhood concerns were voiced that a new policy encompassing varied building heights could allow buildings to rise taller than the Central Place observation deck. The

main concern is that such buildings could adversely impact views from the approved Central Place observation deck, which was a significant community benefit component of that site plan. Earlier in the process, project team analyses on building height and form scenarios found that the existing “taper policy” for Rosslyn building heights will likely create serious development challenges and could result in an undesirable physical environment in certain locations in Rosslyn, particularly on sites in Rosslyn’s higher elevations. A key task of this planning study is to establish greater clarity around the high-priority view corridors from the observation deck that are worth protecting and enhancing. The Plan Framework includes a map identifying such corridors (Map B2) as well as areas where buildings could go taller, which would present opportunities to achieve a greater range of performance criteria and help make Rosslyn an overall better urban place. In the next phase of this process, this and other maps in the Building Height and Form section of the Plan Framework will help inform the development of a more specific heights plan to be provided in the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update.

- **Location of 18th Street Corridor:** In community discussions, property owners have also raised concerns about perceived inconsistencies in how various exhibits in the Plan Framework document are showing the location of the future 18th Street Corridor west of N. Fort Myer Drive. The ultimate alignment is of particular interest to the owners of the Ames Center property in how it may affect feasibility, ease, and potential costs of redeveloping the property with two building towers flanking 18th Street. While the Plan Framework identifies the general location and desired qualities for this proposed corridor, it is important to note that the exact future alignment of this corridor will be determined with future redevelopment. The preferred alignment would provide for a relatively direct and continuous route for 18th Street between N. Oak Street and the Metro station entrance on Fort Myer Drive. Staff will be meeting with the property owners to further discuss this issue.
- **Proposed Open Space on Rosslyn Plaza Block:** In other discussions, property owners of the Rosslyn Plaza block have raised concerns that the rendering and maps in the Plan Framework show an infeasible configuration of buildings and large consolidated open space on the site. The Plan Framework proposes one larger consolidated open space on this block, to capitalize upon this block presenting one of the few opportunities for a large enough open space that can be programmed in part for active recreation. As a proposed Phased Development Site Plan (PDSP) for this block has been under review for nearly two years, the staff preference for a larger consolidated open space that emerged through the review of the PDSP has informed how the open space potential of that site has been considered as part of the Realize Rosslyn process. In the broader Rosslyn framework, the need to achieve facilities for active recreation are critical to fulfilling the Plan Framework’s important goal of creating a balanced and complete open space system to serve the needs of Rosslyn’s populations. Furthermore, the proposed location of the open space along Arlington Ridge Road could provide important linkages and potential synergies with the recommended esplanade abutting the site.
- **Timing of Air Rights Feasibility Study:** A final key issue involves the timing of the proposed public hearings for the Rosslyn Plan Framework and the completion of a

County feasibility study of potential air rights in Rosslyn above I-66. Staff is now initiating a feasibility study of potential air rights to conduct its own assessment to better understand the likely feasibility of such development. The findings of that study, being initiated in response to the Commonwealth of Virginia's own exploration of potential joint partnership air rights development in Rosslyn, will help inform a staff recommendation to the County Board on whether the scope of Realize Rosslyn should be expanded to address potential air rights development. Staff anticipates concluding this feasibility study in the late April to early May timeframe. To address this timing issue, the Plan Framework notes in the introduction of the Policy Directives that if the feasibility study results in an expansion of the Realize Rosslyn scope to address air rights in detail, several of the Policy Directives set forth in this Plan Framework may require additional updates.

Next Steps: Should the County Board adopt the Rosslyn Plan Framework in April 2014, the staff and consultant project team will continue to work with the community to translate the framework into a complete Rosslyn Sector Plan Update. Staff anticipates the community process going forward will include additional Rosslyn Process Panel meetings, meetings with various commissions and stakeholder groups, meetings with affected civic associations, discussions with property owners, and community open houses soliciting broad public input on draft plan elements. At this time, staff anticipates a final draft Rosslyn Sector Plan Update will be presented to the County Board for its consideration before the end of 2014.

CONCLUSION: The proposed Rosslyn Plan Framework is a first step in updating the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update. If adopted, the vision principles and policy directives in the framework will provide guidance for the Sector Plan update as it is drafted through an iterative community review process over the coming months. It is important to note that the Request to Advertise is the first step toward County Board consideration and that authorizing the advertisement does not imply that the County Board supports these elements. The community review process for the Rosslyn Plan Framework is on-going, and it is anticipated that refinements to the framework will be made prior to County Board adoption.

Therefore, staff recommends that the County Board adopt the attached resolution to ratify and authorize advertisement of public hearings on the Rosslyn Plan Framework at the April 12, 2014 County Board meeting and its associated Planning Commission Meeting.

RESOLUTION TO RATIFY AND AUTHORIZE THE ADVERTISEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS TO CONSIDER THE ROSSLYN PLAN FRAMEWORK AT THE MARCH 31, 2014, PLANNING COMMISSION AND APRIL 12, 2014, COUNTY BOARD MEETINGS.

The County Board of Arlington hereby resolves to ratify previously-placed advertisements and authorize further advertisement of public hearings to consider the Rosslyn Plan Framework at the March 31, 2014 Planning Commission and April 12, 2014, County Board Meetings.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
1	LRPC	pp. 13-21 (odd)	<p>Perspective Sketches The sketches in the Vision Principles section should include some type of disclaimer to qualify that they are illustrative only, just one way of achieving the vision for Rosslyn.</p>	<p>We concur that disclaimers should be added. In addition, for purposes of the framework, we will leave these sketches in a pen and ink format since some of the details are open to refinement in development of sector plan. They will be advanced as watercolors for the final Sector Plan Update.</p>	<p>Add disclaimers to all sketch renderings that state: “This rendering is an artistic rendition of one way the Sector Plan vision and recommendations for this element can be achieved, for illustrative purposes only.”</p>
2	LRPC	p. 8	<p>Planning Horizon The Plan document doesn't appear to specify what the planning horizon is.</p>	<p>The first sentence of the second paragraph on page 8 describes the next 20 years as the planning horizon.</p>	<p>We can add a “Planning Horizon” section header before this paragraph.</p>
3	LRPC	p. 11, 15	<p>Skywalks in Renderings/Maps Given language in Policy Directive T9, it would seem appropriate to remove the skywalk from the perspective sketches and the captions. Need to be consistent and clear about the Plan's attitude towards skywalks</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	<p>Sketches and captions will be revised to remove the skywalk, to be consistent with the ultimate vision of removing the skywalk after the creation of the 18th Street corridor.</p>
4	LRPC	pp. 6-8	<p>The Future Community of Rosslyn In the Plan Foundations, would like to see more discussion of the community of people we can expect in 10-20 years, and the idea for a better balance of uses.</p>	<p>We generally concur with this comment, and will explore several options as described to the right.</p>	<p>We will draft text to discuss and describe the envisioned community of people we can expect to live in Rosslyn 20 years out, and consider several options for where it might be located (e.g. Plan Foundations, vision, etc.)</p>
5	LRPC	p. 7	<p>Opportunities/Challenges Section This section could address challenge and opportunities related to land use mix more explicitly than covering it under “Market Position”</p>	<p>We concur, and will add an 8th Challenge/Opportunity elements to the effect of “Land Use Balance”</p>	<p>We will develop an additional Challenge/Opportunity element titled “Land Use Balance”. Text will be developed to describe the challenge of a very heavy office balance, and the opportunity to achieve more housing, add residents, and add vibrancy to the neighborhood for daytime and evening hours.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
6	LRPC	p. 6	<p>Opportunities/Challenges Map Map needs to be more legible. A legend could help clarify what the symbols mean. Also should address that symbols for 3 and 7 apply to much larger areas than conveyed in the map.</p>	<p>We concur that the map is not very legible, and actually believe the thumbnails and Challenge/Opportunity text captions on page 7 can work just fine without the map.</p>	<p>We will remove the Challenges/Opportunities map, while maintaining the images and text on page 8, adding an 8th element to address Land Use Mix.</p>
7	LRPC	p. 8	<p>Likelihood of Change Map The information on this map is too nuanced – consider having two categories: change likely vs. change unlikely. Should this also address likelihood of change for public infrastructure and open space areas?</p>	<p>We concur with the suggestion of boiling the map down to two categories: Change likely vs. Change unlikely.</p> <p>We do not believe it makes sense for this map to make assumptions about areas of public infrastructure likely to change – since the recommendations of this plan should help decide where such change should be desired.</p>	<p>We will update the rendering and legend of the map to show just two categories.</p> <p>We will also add language next to the Likelihood of Change map about a primary goal of this plan being about improving the public realm, and that the recommendations of this plan will help guide where public investments are made in short, mid, and long-term.</p>
8	LRPC	general	<p>Future Transportation System Capacity Has any consideration been given to how current or expanded transportation system has the capacity to address future growth? What type of analysis has been done to explore capacity to address future development potential? Plan Framework should proactively support WMATA's plans for a second Rosslyn Metro station.</p>	<p>The existing planning framework for central Rosslyn, where properties can seek rezoning to “C-O Rosslyn” for projects with densities up to 10 FAR, has been established for the past 18 years. This planning effort is not revisiting this general policy, thereby maintaining the anticipated development potential established with the creation of “C-O Rosslyn”. As such, a primary focus of the transportation planning activities for this effort has been on addressing target mode shares that are desirable and necessary for a well-balanced overall transportation system that can serve Rosslyn well into the future.</p> <p><i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i></p>	<p><i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i></p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
9	LRPC	p. 9	Vision Statement Compared to CC Sector Plan, the Vision Statement is really short, and is so generic it could almost apply to urban center in Arlington.	We concur that the statement can be refined to be a more tailored vision specific to Rosslyn.	We will update the vision statement through efforts to make it more specific to Rosslyn.
10	LRPC	p. 9	Vision Statement Recognizing that the content of the Vision Principles spreads further expresses the vision, it would help to have one page for vision that introduces full hierarchy and structure of vision components.	We concur.	A previous working draft shared with the Process Panel included an introductory page similar to this idea. We will revisit that version and also explore other options to address this comment and provide a better introduction to the organization of this section. .
11	LRPC	p. 17	Sketches/Renderings It is suppositious to show change on properties that are outside of the study area – and would be better to just show the existing conditions.	We concur that it would be better to just show the existing conditions, and will revise the sketch accordingly.	We will revise the mid-ground portion of the sketch area outside of the study area to show existing buildings instead of potential development per existing zoning.
12	LRPC	pp. 13-21 (odd)	Sketches/Renderings It would help to have a key map that shows the viewpoint for each rendering; while still emphasizing that they should not be taken too literally.	We concur.	We will add small thumbnail key maps for each of the six sketch renderings, while also including the proposed disclaimer language proposed in comment #1.
13	LRPC	general	Metrics/Use Mix/Diverse Would like to see more metrics attached to goals for more residential and balanced uses. This would help convey the magnitude of the land use change, and inform potential toolbox to get there. It would also be helpful to define “diverse” – and what the vision statement exactly means by that. How might community facilities and other amenities help advance diversity? Is there analysis on the cost of providing affordable housing within RCRD?	Efforts in the planning process to date have involved a discussion around use mix and the balance of uses in the RCRD. However, as recommendations on use mix are not technically part of the scope of work approved by the County Board, we have not generated any specific recommendations pertaining to future shares of particular land uses as part of the framework. <i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i>	<i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
14	LRPC	pp. 10-11	Multimodality While Vision Principle #3 speaks to walkability, the idea of multimodality seems to be missing from the Vision. For example, doesn't address the focus on a more bicycle friendly place.	Vision Principle #1 focuses on the concept of multimodality, by speaking to transportation choices in the main principle and sub-principle, as well as in the vision paragraph on page 10. The sketch on p. 11 depicts bike share and cycle track facilities that are addressed in the captions.	No proposed changes.
15	LRPC	p. 15	"Rosslyn Highlands" Terminology Sketch caption that makes reference to "Rosslyn Highlands" is confusing, not sure what area this is in referenced too.	We concur this can be more clearly stated.	We will revise the caption to read something like: "Public escalator mitigates the climb to Rosslyn's higher elevations".
16	LRPC	p. 25	"Rosslyn Highlands" Terminology Policy Directive T2 includes reference to "Rosslyn's highlands." Consider revising based on comment above.	We concur this can be clarified.	We will revise the directive language to: "...adding connections among Rosslyn's higher elevations, Metro Station, regional streets, and the Potomac."
17	LRPC	general	Relationship between tall buildings and open space How does the notion of tall buildings needed for redevelopment reconcile with ability to make great urban places – and public open spaces as well? Maybe need to drop assumption that all new open spaces are created through development value.	This plan's perspective is that tall buildings and great open spaces aren't mutually exclusive, with the proper guidelines and regulatory tools. It also anticipates that in some locations, taller buildings may be necessary, for physical and/or economic reasons, to create great open spaces. While not part of the framework, design guidelines and other parameters will be included in the Sector Plan Update to ensure that new development can help frame great public open spaces.	To introduce these notions into the framework, we will review the introductory text for the Building Heights and Form section with the intent to add language that helps explain the perspective and relationship outlined in the cell to the left.
18	LRPC	general	Rosslyn's Role within Arlington Would like to see better description/definition around Rosslyn's role/position within Arlington.	We agree to explore options for better describing the role of Rosslyn within Arlington (and perhaps the region).	We will update Overview text on page 2 to better address Rosslyn's role in Arlington/region.
19	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – Complete streets and vehicular connections Confirm that "vehicular connection" is part of a "complete street"	We will confirm, and revise legend to clarify.	We will revise language for streets in legend to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>General location of new ped/bike or ped-only connection</i> ▪ <i>General location of new complete street</i>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
20	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – Complete streets and vehicular connections Should this map also show alleys with pedestrian connections, such as the one approved as part of the Rosslyn Gateway site plan?	We concur with updating the Block Structure Map with existing or proposed alleys that would be accessible to the public.	We will update Map T1 to add Rosslyn Gateway midblock alley, and investigate whether others need to be added.
21	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – Edge of curb vs. street limits Consider revisions to legend categories given that some streets in Rosslyn may be conceived as curb-less environments.	We concur with revising language to not exclude potential for curb-less environments.	We will modify legend to replace “Edge of curb” with “Limits of Street Travelway”
22	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – Freedom Park/Block Structure Should amend map to depict pedestrian connection extents of Freedom Park as part of the block structure	We concur with showing existing and new pedestrian only corridor locations relating to Freedom Park.	We will modify map to add the Freedom Park pedestrian only corridor to the map – and can distinguish between existing and proposed segments.
23	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – Edge of curb vs. street limits Consider whether there is a need to address two-level street systems in portions of Rosslyn Plaza?	The Rosslyn Plan Framework vision for the Rosslyn Plaza site does not include a two-level street system.	No changes proposed.
24	LRPC	p. 26	North Moore Street Consider designating North Moore as a pedestrian/bike priority street in text and maps.	As Moore Street will continue to be a primary location for bus transit facilities in Rosslyn, designating it a pedestrian/bike priority street would not be appropriate or consistent with parameters set forth in County Master Transportation Plan for this street typology.	No changes proposed.
25	LRPC	p. 25	Map T1 – New connections from Wilson to 18th Street Add the same note about the westernmost connection from Map T2 to Map T1	We concur.	We will update Map T1 to include a similar note as what’s on Map T2, that states: “Proposed only if Pierce is not extended north of Wilson”.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
26	LRPC	p. 26	Map T2 – Arterials vs. Non-Arterials Correct legend to clarify that Type A and B streets are Arterials, and Urban Center Local is non-arterial (but could still include retail); refer to Ground Floor Land Use Map for recommended retail locations	We concur.	We will update Map T2 legend to add “Arterials” above Type A and Type B street types, and “Non-Arterials” above Urban Center Local types.
27	LRPC	p. 27	Map T3– Streetcar linework For potential streetcar linework, arrows should somehow reflect travel in both directions (i.e. to and from DC)	We concur.	We will update MapT3 so that the line depicting the Potential Streetcar Line will have an arrowhead pointing south down Fort Myer Dr, and one pointing north towards the Key Bridge.
28	LRPC	p. 27	T7 – Dispersal of Bus Stops Would recommend that the language specify “future study of bus stop dispersal” rather than being fully committed. Would also help to know current thinking to clarify limits of anticipated bus stop dispersal.	We concur.	We will update T7 to state: “...and Arlington Transit (ART) bus stops, while <u>conducting future study of dispersing</u> locations to better balance....”
29	LRPC	p. 19	Esplanade/River Connections Sketch Omit gondola from sketch on p. 19 and from text on p. 10.	We concur.	We will update sketch on page 19 to remove gondola. We will also update text on page 10 to remove reference to potential gondola.
30	LRPC	general	Map T4-Pedestrian Facilities (and generally other pertinent maps) Consider showing existing vs. future facilities in a way that differentiates between them.	For this framework document, the intent is to have streamline document to show what the ultimate vision is. We intend to include existing conditions diagrams in the full Sector Plan Update that would help depict the differences between existing and proposed.	We will add language to the Policy Directives introduction on page 23 that clarifies these maps are depicting the ultimate future condition at the end of the planning horizon – and qualify that existing conditions diagrams, etc. will be provided in full Sector Plan Update document.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
31	LRPC	p. 28-29	Map T4-Pedestrian Facilities Consider revising name for “Recreational Trail” to something like “Off Street Trail” or “Multi-use Trail.”	We concur.	We will update Map T4 legend to replace “Recreational Trail” with “Multi-use Trail”. Will also use same nomenclature for Map T5
32	LRPC	p. 29	Bicycling Theme? Would like to see a separate theme for bicycling, as a standalone that is parsed out from a theme that combines pedestrian and bicycling.	We believe the current approach of having a combined theme addressing the pedestrian and bike networks is adequate, since the common focus is to make both networks safer, more attractive and accessible.	No changes proposed.
33	LRPC	General	TDM, Parking, Loading and Service Accommodations for Automobile Directives do not explicitly address parking, TDM. Consider the approach the Framework should take on these issues.	We can consider what TDM or parking policy directives should be set forth in the framework document that are particularly important for Rosslyn, if any.	Directive language addressing parking and TDM will be incorporated into current or additional directive(s), which may address concepts such as promoting greater sharing of parking, improved information/wayfinding for public parking access, and TDM agreements with future development projects that further reduce need for new parking facilities.
34	LRPC	General	Role of Multimodal Transportation Study? It would be helpful for the document to be explicit about how much of the RMTS is embodied here and will the RMTS be formally adopted? Relationship to plan?	The Multimodal Transportation Study provides a foundation for the Sector Plan Update, via technical memoranda and graphics comprising analysis and preliminary recommendations. A final draft was completed in September 2012, and it is not anticipated to be further revised or adopted as part of Realize Rosslyn (even though the Rosslyn Framework and Sector Plan Update may ultimately include updated recommendations).	We will explore logical locations to add some language describing the Rosslyn Multimodal Transportation Study early on in the Plan Framework, emphasizing the point that the Sector Plan Update will fully incorporate the spirit of the RMTS, and in most cases will incorporate specific recommendations matching or similar to RMTS recommendations
35	LRPC	p. 30	Overall approach to Parks Network This section could benefit from more description about the philosophy and approach to the parks system.	We concur.	We will develop additional language for the Parks and Open Space introduction describing the philosophy in more detail.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
36	LRPC	p. 31	Net Gain/Loss in open space Would like to know what the proposed network would provide for in terms of net gain in public parks and open space.	The project team is in the process of updating these numbers based on the currently proposed public parks and open space map. We intend to share this updated information on the Planning Commission meeting. <i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i>	<i>This item will also be addressed in more detail at the March Planning Commission meeting.</i>
37	LRPC	p. 31	Public vs. Private How best to differentiate between publicly owned and privately owned, publicly accessible open space?	This document defines “Public Open Space” as space available to the public, regardless of private ownership or public ownership. We do not see the need for distinguishing the ownership conditions as part of this discussion.	No changes proposed.
38	LRPC	p. 31	Rosslyn Plaza Park Is the location and configuration of the open space shown on Rosslyn Plaza deliberate? What is shown differs from what is currently proposed by the PDSP.	Yes, it is deliberate. The vision is for a consolidated open space along the east side of the block. Instead of being a retail-activated plaza along Kent Street, this would be a space largely focused on active recreation opportunities that relates well to the Esplanade.	No changes proposed.
39	LRPC	p. 31	Vision for Park Programming Be more explicit about park programming, such as green versus hardscape spaces. What happens where? Need narrative with more specific intent about how a full set of recreation needs will be met.	More details about potential programming of each space are to be provided in the full Sector Plan Update.	When revising the language in the introduction for this section, we can be more explicit about a complete system that meets a full set of recreational needs.
40	LRPC	p. 31	Urban Street Focal Point This type of space seems better put in urban design category.	This makes sense, and perhaps gets addressed in the design guidelines and other details of the full Sector Plan Update.	We will update Map P1 to remove the instances and category of Urban Street Focal Point.
41	LRPC	General	Corridor of Light Should the Corridor of Light be specifically addressed as part of the framework?	We do not believe the Corridor of Light should be specifically identified as part of the framework, especially given the extent of the project may be reduced and a portion of the project is in the process of being reconsidered. The reference to public art more broadly covers this in a more general way.	No changes proposed.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
42	LRPC	p. 32	Reference to Open Space in WRAPS Review whether reference to WRAPS really needed.	Our view is that it is important to recognize and acknowledge WRAPS as immediate context, as supported by the Process Panel.	No changes proposed.
43	LRPC	p. 31	Freedom Park Extension and Loss of Access The plan should provide clarity around how the extension of Freedom Park into 17 th Street would affect existing/potential future access to garage/service/etc.	We concur. One logical option would be to include a caption on the sketch rendering that speaks to this item.	Add/revise caption on Sketch/renderings that speaks to necessary changes to building's garage and service access, through redevelopment.
44	LRPC	p. 35	Air Rights – Timing and Deliverables What is the timing of the air rights pre-feasibility study related to the timing of this framework?	The original scope of work for Realize Rosslyn did not include the detailed study of air rights. Parallel with the Realize Rosslyn process, there has been a growing potential interest in air rights development for Rosslyn, which will soon be looked at as part of a County pre-feasibility study. Anticipated in 6 to 8 weeks, the results of that study will help inform a recommendation to the County Board as to whether or not the scope should be revised to have Realize Rosslyn address air rights, and at what level of detail.	No proposed changes.
45	LRPC	p. 35	Air Rights Seems like there might be a need for a placeholder related to Air Rights in every section. How to address?	While this may be true, the intent here is to include a statement about the degree to which air rights should be studied as part of Realize Rosslyn. Depending on the outcome of the pre-feasibility study, there might be revisions to the number and location of Policy Directives addressing air rights in the framework.	To address this point, we will consider moving this statement to the Plan Foundations section where it would properly apply more generally to plan considerations, and be understood up front.
46	LRPC	p. 35	Lynn St north of 19th Struggle to see this as being a Primary active frontage for priority retail.	Given that Lynn Street is currently the most established retail corridor in Rosslyn, soon to be augmented by Central Place residential property, the potential redevelopment of the RCA building with retail along Lynn Street would well establish opportunity for two-sided retail along that block.	No proposed changes.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
47	LRPC	p. 33	Placement of Block Structure Map Consider moving or duplicating the Block Structure Map to the Urban Design section; maybe in place of the GLUP map which doesn't seem like it adds value here.	We believe the Block Structure Map makes sense and works well based on how it is currently located in the document.	No proposed changes.
48	LRPC	General	Achievable Densities What is the upper limit of density within the RCRD, particularly in terms of what the transportation system can support?	Please see response to Comment #8.	No proposed changes.
49	LRPC	p. 35	Map U2 Should revisit language describing the categories to clarify that retail would not be precluded along the blue and yellow frontages.	We concur.	We will revise the page layout that includes this map, and the map legend, to clarify the intent.
50	LRPC	p. 37	Building Heights Policy Should state what current building form/height framework is today and be explicit about rethinking of taper policy. Introduction could benefit from additional description on the approach to achieve peaks and valleys – and the desired goals of that new heights approach.	We concur.	We will revise introductory language for this section to address this existing vs. proposed policy details. We will also investigate possibly adding this distinction within the directive itself, if it makes sense.
51	LRPC	p. 38	B1 – Meaning of Height “Options” Framework should be clear about who's making decisions on building heights proposed in site plans, especially the idea of “options.”	We concur.	We will revisit the exact wording of this directive, as it's not really about options that owners could exercise, as much as it is around the potential for more greatly varied heights.
52	LRPC	p. 38	B1 – Potential Tools Project Team should provide examples of potential tools that can be used to achieve a Peaks and Valleys approach and supports urban design goals (e.g. tower separation, stepbacks, etc.) at the PC meeting.	The intent is to address these details in the Sector Plan Update.	At the PC Meeting, we can include a list of the types of building form and heights tools and design parameters that we will explore in our efforts to develop the Sector Plan update to help achieve a Peaks and Valleys approach.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
53	LRPC	p. 38	<i>Building Heights and Views</i> Need to consider policy of encouraging more views in general (similar to San Francisco), putting taller buildings on higher ground and lower buildings lower. There can be a County interest in maximizing views from all buildings.	The suggested policy has clear merit and has been considered in preliminary analysis of building height and form, but should be considered in the context of other building form criteria as well, since sites on Rosslyn's higher ground tend to be closest to sensitive neighborhood context, and have a more constrained development envelope (as confined by ground elevation and aircraft flight paths) than sites at lower elevations. The "Peaks and Valleys" concept includes intent to vary building height in ways that promote greater view opportunities at least at a local block-to-block scale, if not at the district-wide scale suggested here.	No changes proposed at this time.
54	LRPC	p. 38	<i>Vision for 18th Street</i> Seems like vision for 18 th Street may include vision of street mainly as promenade, or a ped/bike priority street. This should be a space that is open and inviting, with a notion of building stepbacks that create a human scale.	We generally agree with this vision, and for the imperative and opportunity for great public spaces along the corridor even with what may be somewhat modest opportunities for building step backs. The details of the proposed vision for this space will be addressed as part of design guidelines to be developed in the full Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed at this time.
55	LRPC	p. 38	<i>Transitions</i> Consideration should be given to transitions within the RCRD (e.g. 18 th Street), not just at the edges.	We generally agree with this concept that there may be desired types of transitions between adjacent areas, and see this being addressed as part of design guidelines to be developed in the full Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed at this time.
56	LRPC	p. 40	<i>Ground Level View Corridors</i> 40' corridor minimum for portions of 18 th Street seems to narrow – should be a more generous width.	We had proposed 40' as the minimum width, but can reevaluate this in developing the Sector Plan Update to look at a number of options and see if this recommendation should be revised to call for greater width.	We will omit the specific reference to a 40' dimension for these corridors on the framework map. This item will be addressed, possibly with a revised recommended width, as part of the full Sector Plan Update.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
57	LRPC	General	<p><i>Level of Detail of Framework</i> <i>Compared with the Crystal City Policy Framework, the Rosslyn Plan Framework has less detail on a number of items.</i></p>	<p>All of our plan framework or policy framework documents are not exactly the same, with each taking on its own identity and character informed by the specifics of the project. While there may be several items in the Rosslyn Framework that are not at the same level of development as they were in the Crystal City Framework (building heights and form being one example), they will be fully addressed through the development of the complete Sector Plan Update.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>
58	LRPC	p. 28	<p><i>Future Study of the Skywalks (T9)</i> <i>For T9, page 28, should change the wording to add a phrase to “<u>re-evaluate the skywalks at such time a newly created, safe and direct 18th Street connection could accommodate similar travel patters....”</u>. Recognizing that retention of the skywalk could help provide a “sheltered” environment for transit riders.</i></p>	<p>The recommendation at this time is to focus on the ground level experience over the long term. With the creation of a great 18th Street connection through this area, the skywalks become redundant. In light of the need for ADA compliance for any newly built or replacement segments of the skywalk, the costs associate with jump elevators, etc. could compete with resources for other community benefits recommended for the plan.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
1	PC	p. 7	Opportunities/Challenges Section For Opportunity 6, add reference to “expand urban open spaces.”	We concur.	We will revise the text to reflect opportunities to create new open spaces.
2	PC	p. 7	Opportunities/Challenges Section For Opportunity 7, add reference to “minimizing bulk and mass”	Our view is that statements regarding bulk and mass are most useful in the context of an overall urban form framework that recommends minimizing the negative effects of bulk and mass on the pedestrian environment.	No changes proposed to this specific section at this time, but we will revise the vision principles and policy directives to include this sentiment.
3	PC	General	Framework Adoption How will the adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework affect site plan applications that are in process?	Per County Board direction in a January 2011 work session, site plan applications could be submitted and reviewed under the existing planning and zoning framework prior to the completion of the Sector Plan Update. That said, in the process of reviewing pending site plans since then, staff has drawn from recommendations of the Multimodal Transportation Study and the ideas emerging from Realize Rosslyn to help suggest refinements to proposed site plans.	No changes proposed.
4	PC	p. 2	Expected Level of Development The overview section should include an order of magnitude of the new development expected within the planning horizon.	We concur.	We will revise the overview to summarize the forecasted amount of new development for 2040 based on the latest data from the MWCOG regional cooperative forecasts.
5	PC	pp. 10-21	Vision Principles Are the vision principles ordered by priority? Principle 6 (dynamic place) or Principle 2 (global destination) should be the first principle listed rather than transportation/accessibility	The vision principles were not ordered based on priority or perceived level of importance.	We will revise the order to switch Vision Principles 1 and 2 so that “global destination comes first”, keeping the rest the same.
6	-	-	THIS COMMENTS WAS DELETED AS IT IS ADDRESSED IN COMMENT #27	-	-

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
7	PC	p. 18	Connections to Nature Add the words “tree-lined” to the vision principle to support a greener environment in Rosslyn.	We concur.	We will revise Principle 5 (connections to nature) to say “Rosslyn will be a tree-lined urban district...”
8	PC	p. 25	Location of 18th Street Is the location of 18 th Street on Map T1 and other graphics fixed? If so, would such a location preclude the development of two new buildings on the Ames Center site?	The map legend and Directive T1 indicate that the locations for new connections are general in nature. Our assessment at this time is that an 18 th Street corridor in the general location shown in the framework maps would permit two buildings with redevelopment of the Ames Center site, recognizing that unless the church/gas station property is included, the northern building tower would likely result in a point tower with residential or hotel use based on the maximum achievable tower floor plate size.	No changes proposed at this time.
9	PC	p. 35	Lynn St South of Wilson Concern about this block being a Primary Active frontage for priority retail.	Given that Lynn Street is currently the most established retail corridor in Rosslyn, soon to be augmented by Central Place residential property, the ultimate vision is for the potential redevelopment of buildings south of Wilson along the east side of Lynn Street with ground floor retail could establish two-sided retail along that block.	In developing detailed documentation for the Sector Plan Update, we will explore opportunities to qualify that some interim non-retail uses may be appropriate on an interim basis in the Primary Active Uses frontages, although the ultimate vision is for retail to be achieved.
10	PC	p. 20	Unique Mix of People and Activity What is meant by “its unique mix of people and activity?” Unique relative to what?	Because of its status as the gateway to Northern Virginia and its excellent transportation connections, Rosslyn brings together a greater mix of people than Arlington’s other transit areas.	We will clarify revise this vision principle to omit the term “unique”, focusing on the “mix of people and activity” itself as contributing to a dynamic Rosslyn.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
11	PC	p. 28	<p><i>Future Study of the Skywalks (T9)</i> Consider not predetermining that the skywalks over Nash and Fort Myer Streets will be removed. This is an element of neighborhood preservation because the skywalks are well used by residents of the surrounding communities and are a part of their neighborhood identity.</p>	<p>The proposed approach is to put forth a recommendation on what should happen to the skywalks once the 18th Street connection between Moore Street and Oak Street is completed. Removing the skywalk once a new, attractive and safe ground level connection is achieved would be consistent with Master Transportation Plan policies regarding skywalks, and would help further activate the 18th Street corridor by focusing pedestrian activity at ground level. Establishing the intent now is also important to inform decisions on whether future site plans encompassing existing segments of the skywalk should be rebuilt with new skywalk segments.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>
12	PC	p. 34	<p><i>Density Above Current Plan</i> Will densities above those currently planned for Rosslyn (i.e. 10 FAR max in C-O Rosslyn) be considered as part of the Sector Plan Update? If so, how will that affect transportation demand?</p>	<p>The Sector Plan explorations will only consider the potential for densities above 10 FAR on a project basis with the potential applications of TDRs – if it is ultimately determined that TDRs should be applied within the RCRD. Given numerous constraints placed on development in the area, it is anticipated that any density above 10FAR from the use of TDRs will not represent a significant increase, and therefore additional impacts on transportation demand should be minimal. Also, any future site plan would be required to include a Traffic Impact Analysis to identify and determine potential impacts to the system.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time. (This detail will be discussed as part of the documentation for the full Sector Plan Update.)</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
13	PC	p. 32	<p>Privately Owned Open Space Add a new policy directive under Public Parks and Open Space Theme 3 that addresses privately owned spaces that are available for public use.</p>	<p>From a policy framework perspective, the term “public parks and open spaces” is using “public” in the sense of spaces that are accessible to the public – whether owned publicly or privately. Regardless of ownership, such spaces should be designed, programmed and managed in a way such that they should be largely indistinguishable. For public open space or park areas that are privately owned, the County, by practice, would pursue public access easements at a minimum to ensure public access to the space into the future.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>
14	PC	p. 32	<p>Relief from the Urban Environment The phrase “relief from the urban environment” in Parks and Open Space Theme 3 has a negative connotation and should be revised to be more positive.</p>	<p>We concur</p>	<p>We will revise the text to be more positive.</p>
15	PC	p. 27	<p>Transit Center Related to Directive T7, should Rosslyn have a transit center that consolidates bus stops within a building rather than on the street?</p>	<p>For Rosslyn, a potential indoor transit center would need to address a number of technical, spatial, and other parameters that would, if pursued, add significant cost to the project. Bus types used in Rosslyn would mandate that buildings have adequate venting, vertical clearance, special fixtures, constant surveillance, that would all involve increased capital and operating costs. Such a facility would also need considerable space for vehicle maneuvering and for people to use the facility, and could have downside of taking transit out of views of pedestrians. Cumulatively, these factors would all need to be taken into consideration if such a facility were pursued in Rosslyn in the future.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
16	PC	p. 38	<p>Peaks and Valleys Directive B1 should clarify what the “Peaks and Valleys” approach to building heights means.</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	<p>We will revisit language in Directive B1 to see how it might be expanded to help clarify what is meant by “Peaks and Valleys”</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
17	PC	p. 39	Priority View Corridors Map (Map B2) Does Map B2 set building heights?	No. The view corridors shown on Map B2 will be one of several elements that will inform a future building heights map for Rosslyn. The intent of this map is primarily to identify Priority View Corridors that should be preserved to the extent feasible through the building heights map to be set forth in the Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed.
18	PC	p. 39	Heights Exceeding 300 Feet If the height limit of 300 feet in “C-O Rosslyn” is increased, would the maximum FAR also increase?	Not necessarily, and for purposes of this study, we are generally not revisiting densities, except for the potential application of TDRs, which would be the only situation which might result in total project densities exceeding 10FAR.	No changes proposed.
19	PC	General	Future recommendations for tools/strategies to manage building form/densities Will the public, PC, and Process Panel be involved in providing input on the recommended strategies to manage building form and density before it gets to the County Board for a vote, as part of the Sector Plan Update?	Yes, immediately after adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework, project team will work with the Process Panel to explore preliminary ideas to help shape emerging recommendations on how building form, heights and densities should be managed per the plan. Once ready, the project team would seek broader feedback beyond the Process Panel on recommendations, including LRPC/Planning Commission, before presenting a recommendation to the County Board.	No changes proposed.
20	PC	p. 35	Air Rights Study Will the results of the Air Rights Study be presented to the LRPC or the PC prior to being presented to the Board?	Staff will determine the appropriate forum to discuss findings from the feasibility study on air rights, before presenting a recommendation to the County Board.	No changes proposed.
21	PC	General	Public Comments on Draft Framework Will staff be responding to testimony provided at PC public hearing?	Yes.	Any changes to the Framework based on public comments will be included in this matrix.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
22	PC	p. 9	MOTION – Diversity Elaborate on how the term "diverse community" found in the Vision Statement translates to goals for office versus residential uses, unit types, unit sizes, and levels of affordability.	In this case, diversity is being applied generally to a broad range of demographic characteristics.	Text will be added to the Plan Foundations section that elaborates on existing demographics profile in Rosslyn and what may be expected in the future.
23	PC	p. 20	MOTION – Land Use Mix Define use mix targets necessary to support the vibrant 18/7 street life outlined in the plan vision.	We concur that the vision set forth in this plan should be supported by more information pertaining to Use Mix. We can provide in the document more information on existing land use, as well as depict the current forecasts for use mix in Rosslyn based on MWCOG information.	We will update the document to include more information on existing use mix and current forecasts for use mix in the RCRD in the future.
24	PC	pp. 24-29	MOTION – Parking Include parking policies regarding parking ratios, location of garage entrances, and permissiveness of above grade parking structures	Specific parking ratios, locations of garage entrances, and permissiveness of above grade parking structures are all items we intend to address as part of the Sector Plan Update, following adoption of the Rosslyn Plan Framework.	No changes proposed.
25	PC	pp. 33-36	MOTION – Public Facilities Provide information if any new public facilities are required or proposed.	In the course of developing more specific use mix targets, we can consider what needs there may be to undertake future study on potential public facilities in Rosslyn.	No changes proposed at this time; in developing the Sector Plan Update, there may be determination for additional future study needed to address public facility needs for Rosslyn.
26	PC	pp. 37-40	MOTION – Building Height Provide examples of how the Peaks & Valley concept could constrain heights at various locations in order to provide additional clarification.	This comment is being generally addressed based largely on proposed changes being made to the document in response to Comment #16.	No changes proposed.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
27	PC	pp. 10-21	MOTION – Urban Form Add new principle, to provide a vision that achieves a desirable urban form to the Rosslyn Plan	While we recognize the importance of urban form to the future of Rosslyn, our view is that this comment is best addressed by strengthening the urban form component within the current six vision principles rather than adding a new principle.	We will modify the text and graphics supporting Principle 2 (global destination), Principle 3 (walkable neighborhood), and Principle 4 (good neighbor) to specifically address urban form elements such as distinctive architecture, a varied skyline, and context-sensitive design.
28	PC	p. 36	MOTION – Tree Canopy Achieve a substantial increase in the tree canopy throughout the urban district reduce urban heat, improve air quality, provide human scale and bring nature into the city environment.	We concur with the value of establishing a goal for tree canopy coverage in the RCRD, but need additional time to conduct the appropriate analysis that should help inform a recommendation. A directive can be added now to address this point generally, and the provision of a specific tree canopy coverage goal can be addressed as part of the Sector Plan Update.	We will add a new Directive in the Urban Design, Land Use and Sustainability section to address this point.
29	Prop. Owner – Weissberg (RCA)	p. 35	Map U2 - Ground Floor Land Use Lynn Street north of 19 th Street has difficult time leasing ground floor retail space. Revise Map U2 so that the section of Lynn Street north of 19 th Street is designated for “Secondary Active Uses.”	Map U2 is not intended to indicate locations of required retail but rather locations where retail is strongly encouraged. Given that Lynn Street is currently the most established retail corridor in Rosslyn, soon to be augmented by Central Place residential property, the ultimate vision is for the potential redevelopment of buildings south of Wilson along the east side of Lynn Street with ground floor retail could establish two-sided retail along that block.	We will revisit legend of Map U2 to examine opportunities for clarifying intent of “Primary Active Use (priority retail)” designation. Also, in developing detailed documentation for the Sector Plan Update, we will explore opportunities to qualify that some interim non-retail uses may be appropriate on an interim basis in the Primary Active Uses frontages, although the ultimate vision is for retail to be achieved.
30	Prop. Owner – Weissberg (RCA)	p. 35	Map T2 – Street Classification Lynn Street north of 19 th Street has difficult time leasing ground floor retail space. Revise Map T2 so that the section of Lynn Street north of 19 th Street is designated as serving “Primary Urban Mixed-Use.”	See response to Comment #29 related to vision for Lynn Street.	No changes proposed.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
31	Prop. Owner – Weissberg (RCA)	p. 38 - 40	<p>Building Height and Form The Plan contains a number of potential restrictions on height, including a new “Peaks and Valleys” height policy, designation of a number of “View Corridors” from both the Observation Deck and street level, and three different “sensitive edge transition” designations. Defer recommendation on Maps B1, B2, and B3, and Policies B1, B1.a, and B2 until the impacts of these policies and designations on the affected areas can be identified and considered.</p>	<p>As described in the introductory text to the Building Height and Form section on page 37, Maps B1, B2, and B3 do not convey height restrictions but rather lay the foundation for future study and forthcoming sector plan guidance on building heights for areas within the RCRD.</p> <p>This comment is being generally addressed based largely on proposed changes being made to the document in response to Comment #16.</p>	<p>Per Response to Comment 16, revisions are being made to this section to clarify the Policy Directives and the principles to be set forth in them, and that the role of this directives is ultimately to help inform the development of the Building Heights Plan as part of the Sector Plan Update.</p>
32	Prop. Owner – Weissberg (RCA)	n/a	<p>RCA Redevelopment The Plan does not acknowledge recommendations from the Rosslyn Multimodal Transportation Study (RMTS) regarding use of the loop road for RCA redevelopment and preservation of Moore Street and Lynn Street access for that future redeveloped building. We request that language be added to the Plan stating that its recommendations do not conflict with the Rosslyn Multimodal Transit Study.</p>	<p>The RMTS provides a foundation for the Sector Plan Update, via technical memoranda and graphics comprising analysis and preliminary recommendations.</p> <p>In many cases the Plan Framework and ultimately the Sector Plan Update recommendations will reflect recommendations from the RMTS, and in some cases the framework and Sector Plan Update will present revised thinking.</p> <p>The Block Structure Map (T1) reflects the vacation of the contra flow lines abutting this site, as recommended in the RMTS (and the 1992 Rosslyn Station Area Plan). Recommendations on access points for garage entries, service and loading locations will be addressed as part of the Sector Plan Update design guidelines.</p>	<p>We will revisit the introductory language to the Transportation section on page 24 to better clarify the relationship between the RMTS recommendations and those set forth in the Framework (and ultimately in the Sector Plan Update).</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
33	Prop. Owner – Weissberg (RCA)	n/a	<p><i>Lynn Street Improvements</i> The Plan calls for significant public improvements on Lynn Street. We are concerned that County planning documents call for Lynn Street to shoulder a disproportionate burden of public improvements, particularly in light of the crucial role Lynn Street plays in traffic operations throughout Rosslyn. We request that language be added to the Plan stating that its recommendations do not prohibit curb cuts and parking/loading on any particular roads.</p>	<p>In the future, Lynn Street is envisioned to become an even greater main street for Rosslyn than it is today. As such, during the development of the Sector Plan Update, design guidelines and other recommendations will address in more detail how and where curb cuts and parking/loading access points should be encouraged along all streets in the RCRD.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
34	Prop. Owner – Snell (Ames Center)	p. 9, 11, 15, and 40	<p><i>18th Street Alignment</i> Map B3 identifies the 18th Street view corridor as a “general (view) corridor location” that does not correctly overlay the preferred alignment of 18th Street as expressed throughout the rest of the document. A northward alignment would restrict preservation of two buildable sites and thus severely hinder the redevelopment potential of the Ames Center. Map B3 and the renderings on pages 9, 11, and 15 should be changed to indicate a “specific corridor location” that matches the alignment represented in Map T1.</p>	<p>Staff is in the process of setting up a discussion with this owner to better understand the specifics of this comment before providing a project team response and any potentially proposed changes.</p>	<p>No changes proposed at this time.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
35	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	n/a	<p>Building Height and Form The document does not address economic development, financial feasibility, or the underlying principles of “CO-Rosslyn” to encourage and incentivize redevelopment through increased height and density, with resulting community benefits. This should be included with a description of how this framework either supports or intends to amend those underlying principles.</p>	<p>We concur that these are important concepts and would add value to the document by addressing them as part of the “Plan Foundations” section.</p>	<p>“Plan Foundations” section to be revised to add a discussion on the background of “C-O Rosslyn”, its primary goals to encourage redevelopment (rather than renovation), and that the intent is to generally continue that approach into the future horizon of this plan, but to ensure that the community benefits are working together to achieve coordinated plan improvements that will help achieve the plan vision.</p>
36	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	n/a	<p>Building Height and Form The current tapering principles of “CO-Rosslyn” are to taper from the Metro towards the single family neighborhoods, not simply taper in a cylindrical cone manner as the document implies. This should be clarified as also evidenced by several “CO-Rosslyn” approved redevelopment projects.</p>	<p>Previously adopted County Board resolutions addressing building heights in Rosslyn have not been explicitly clear about the tapering principles of “C-O Rosslyn”. This situation is one of the major reasons we are studying this issue as part of this study.</p> <p>In terms of approved “C-O Rosslyn” projects, Central Place Office, Residential and 1812 N Moore range between 348’-387’ above site elevation. All other blocks outside of the two Central Place blocks are currently limited to 300’ in height, as evidenced by 1801 Lynn, Waterview, Turnberry, and Rosslyn Gateway, which are all within 1 block of Central Place. This collection of existing and approved buildings are moving towards a tapering down from the center, though to date there haven’t been any approved projects to demonstrate how that taper might continue for sites that are further from the center of Rosslyn.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
37	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	n/a	<p>Plan Foundations There needs to be up-front language about allowing flexibility to deviate from the described vision in consideration of actual circumstances, market conditions, and existing condition that can't possibly be known or fleshed through in a planning process.</p>	<p>In practice, Sector Plans, Area plans, and similar planning documents serve as guides, and inherently have a level of built-in flexibility. As such, it is unnecessary to add the suggested language.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>
38	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	n/a	<p>Plan Foundation The designation of Arlington Ridge Road as "River Edge" is misleading. The river is not visible from either Arlington Ridge Road or Kent Street elevations. This also needs to be clarified in Plan Foundation opportunity number 1 in regards to programming "public spaces at Rosslyn's edges to embrace the Potomac River landscape". This implies views that do not exist from ground level "River Edge" designated areas.</p>	<p>The Sensitive Edge Transitions Map (B1) includes map notations that specify the elements that should be considered for various transition types. For "River Edge", those include consideration of "view impacts, scale transition to Potomac Landscape, appearance from Monumental Core and other regional viewpoints." The River Edge condition does not deal with visibility to the river.</p> <p>We do not interpret "public spaces at Rosslyn's edges to embrace the Potomac River landscape" to be applied strictly to "River Edge" transitions zones, but to open space located along Rosslyn's edges more generally. While not specific, Gateway Park, Freedom Park, and the proposed Boathouse would be a few examples of such edge spaces that would have areas within them offering views of the river landscape.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>
39	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	n/a	<p>Building Height and Form The Policy Directives and accompanying maps seem final. What is the economic, FAR, and height impact on future CO-Rosslyn developments?</p>	<p>The building form and massing directives do not provide a specific heights map or any other indication of how heights would be managed more specifically across sites in the RCRD. These details would be addressed after adoption of the Plan Framework and during development of the draft Sector Plan Update – and development economics and feasibility analysis (based in part on achievable densities) will be factored into these recommendations.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
40	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	p. 6-7	<p>Plan Foundation Plan Foundation number 7 seems extremely specific and financially infeasible to single out one already developed location as the sole area for increased variety of building height, form and architecture in all of Rosslyn.</p>	<p>We concur – and the intent was not to focus in on one particular site at the exclusion of others.</p>	<p>Based on this and other comments, we are removing the Challenges and Opportunities Map, and will rely solely on the thumbnail images and captions to express Challenges and Opportunities.</p>
41	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	p. 11	<p>Plan Sketches 18th Street as well as many of the other perspective drawings seems very detailed and prescriptive for this level of planning. They should be noted as illustrative only.</p>	<p>We concur that disclaimers should be added. In addition, for purposes of the framework, we will leave these sketches in a pen and ink format since some of the details are open to refinement in development of sector plan. They will be advanced as watercolors for the final Sector Plan Update.</p>	<p>Add disclaimers to all sketch renderings that state: “This rendering is an artistic rendition of one way the Sector Plan vision and recommendations for this element can be achieved, for illustrative purposes only.”</p>
42	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	p. 15	<p>Skywalks Referenced “skywalks.” Do we really want to go back there? Recommend removing.</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	<p>Sketches and captions will be revised to remove the skywalk, to be consistent with the ultimate vision of removing the skywalk after the creation of the 18th Street corridor, as expressed in Policy Directive T9.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
43	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	p. 19	<p>Rosslyn Plaza Shows an infeasible configuration for this location and goes so far as to point to specific buildings for use as “premier housing, workplace and hotel...” and upper level public viewpoints. This needs to be removed so as to not inappropriately influence a PDSP currently under review. Also the graphic implies views of the Potomac when such views do not exist from that “Promenade” level.</p>	<p>Staff will be meeting with the property owners with the hope of better understanding why they view the configuration of the open space shown in this location as infeasible, and also why they recommend removal of a caption that highlights potential buildings on this site to provide for premier housing, workplace and hotel addresses.</p> <p>We concur with the comments on captions noting upper level public viewpoints, and will revise captions to address.</p> <p>The illustration depicts a general open space size and configuration consistent with concepts advanced and recommended by staff in the review of the PDSP prior to the emergence of Realize Rosslyn ideas about this site.</p> <p>This graphic is depicted as a bird’s eye view drawing from a viewpoint approximately 5 to 6 stories above the Esplanade level. Persons or birds at that elevation would have views of the river.</p>	We will modify caption addressing view points to note as “Upper level viewpoints for building occupants to survey the National Mall”
44	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	P 13,32, 39	<p>View Corridors Need to clarify the term “public views.” Historically, it has been County policy to not protect private views from buildings. Such policy has been demonstrated time and time again with the approval of CO-Rosslyn redevelopment projects. Again, what’s the trade-off of proposed view corridors to future economic development and ensuing community benefits potential?</p>	Staff will be meeting with the property owners to gain more information about their concerns with need to clarify “public views”.	---

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
45	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	p. 19	<p>Rosslyn Plaza Park The configuration and size of the open space labeled Rosslyn Plaza is not realistic.</p>	<p>Based on staff studies associated with the pending PDSP for this block, it appears that buildings can be configured on this block in a way that would allow for open space of this size and configuration and still achieve a 10 FAR sought under “C-O Rosslyn” zoning. We acknowledge there is a fundamental difference of opinion between the applicant and project team for the most desirable and recommended programming and activating uses for this proposed open space.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>
46	Prop. Owner – Vornado (Rosslyn Plaza)	P 35	<p>Map U2 – Ground Floor Land Use The retail locations and recommendations seem extremely detailed and prescriptive. Has any retail study been performed which supports these recommendations?</p>	<p>Map U2 is not intended to indicate locations of required retail but rather locations where retail is encouraged. A goal of this map is to help focus retail activity in the future to ensure the creation of vibrant retail nodes, rather than thinly spreading retail out throughout the district.</p> <p>A specific retail study has not been performed, but the amount of Priority Active retail frontages depicted is strongly informed by general County forecasts for amount of retail space that may be provided with future redevelopment. In the absence of a retail market study, we have heard from stakeholder varied opinions about the strength of Rosslyn’s retail market, both today and in the future.</p>	<p>We will update Map U2 legend to clarify intent of “priority retail” designation.</p>
47	Stan Karson (RAFOM CA)	p. 26	<p>Two-Way Traffic on Fort Myer Drive and Lynn Street Directive T3 could negatively impact on rush hour traffic on Key Bridge and Meade Street Bridge.</p>	<p>Our view is that converting Fort Myer and Lynn to two-way traffic will enhance pedestrian safety and facilitate the walkable environments envisioned for these streets. Directive T3 also states that this change in traffic patterns should be “contingent upon adequate feasibility studies, monitoring, and mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.”</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
48	Stan Karson (RAFOM CA)	p. 38	Peaks and Valleys Height Approach The current policy to taper heights from the Central Place is preferred to the proposed approach that could allow buildings taller buildings in areas that are not designated as priority view corridors. Views from the Central Place observation deck should be preserved.	One of the goals of Realize Rosslyn is to consider alternatives to the taper policy, which would not achieve a varied skyline and could negatively impact the public realm in areas where high densities are allowed but heights are constrained. Directive B1.b and Map B2 recommend preserving the highest priority view corridors from the observation deck, including views to the Monumental Core, Georgetown, Upper Potomac Gorge, and Rock Creek Park.	We will revise the building height policy directives to better articulate the objectives of the height policy that will be developed as the Sector Plan Update is drafted.
49	Stan Karson (RAFOM CA)	p. 8	Diversity and Affordable Housing The vision statement includes a “diverse community,” but the housing built in the RCRD to date is very high cost.	Strategies to provide affordable housing in Rosslyn will be pursued with the Sector Plan Update.	No proposed changes.
50	Tom Korns	p. 7	Ferry Service A ferry service facility should be added to the Key Bridge shore.	Ferry service was not identified in the Rosslyn Multimodal Transportation Study and to date has not been considered in our work on Realize Rosslyn. Should regional efforts open up opportunities for ferry service for Rosslyn in the future, it would be something to analyze at that time.	No proposed changes.
51	Tom Korns	p. 7	Building Form Opportunities Human scaled building elements (balconies, green terraces, etc.) should be encouraged, and the public should have access to high places as well as the street level.	We agree that human scaled building elements should be encouraged, and we anticipate addressing them as part of the detail to be developed for the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update. In terms of public access to high places, the Central Place observation deck is envisioned to be the primary opportunity for this.	No proposed changes.
52	Tom Korns	p. 7	Special Destination Character Capitalize on Rosslyn’s crossroads transit center character with special destination character, such as art and entertainment district, wild river access and access to high views.	We agree with capitalizing on Rosslyn’s special destination character, including art and entertainment, as well as its access to the river and views from the to be built observation deck.	No proposed changes.

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
53	Tom Korns	p. 25, 28	<p>Pedestrian Facilities Include Freedom Park as part of the pedestrian transportation system. Add to Map T4 existing level pedestrian connection from Oak Street/16th Road to the BAE building and its view terraces and access to Freedom Park and points beyond.</p>	<p>We agree with adding Freedom Park where segments of it are currently missing on certain maps. In terms of the BAE building open space, there are a number of similar spaces throughout Rosslyn, that to show this one on the map could result in an inconsistent approach.</p>	<p>Maps T1 and T4 have been updated to include have been updated to show segments of Freedom Park.</p>
54	Tom Korns	p. 31	<p>Public Parks & Open Space Add to Map P1 BAE overlooks as public belvedere space. Add possible “high places” public access spaces.</p>	<p>In terms of the BAE building open space, there are a number of similar spaces throughout Rosslyn, that to show this one on the map could result in an inconsistent approach.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>
55	Tom Korns	p. 32	<p>Gateway Park Super Structure Doesn't support removal of Gateway Park super structure. Parts of it might be useful in a redesign.</p>	<p>Based on the strong support from the October workshop and other considerations, this framework sets for the idea of removing the superstructure as an important goal for improving the space.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>